

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I agree certainly with the sharp criticism against the government and the leaders of Iraq. I do disagree with what we are trying to do here, not because it is not well motivated, but I do not see that we have the authority to all of a sudden impose our system of justice across the entire world. I do not think it is effective. I think it drums up anti-American hostility more than it achieves justice.

But there is a bit of inconsistency here. Earlier it was mentioned that it is not only the Iraqis that abuse the Kurds, the Turks do it as well. Why are the Turks not included in this? Why do we not call them out and put them on the carpet and demand justice from the Turks? But they happen to be our allies.

At the same time, we ignore other major problems. What did we do with China? The leaders of China came here, they got the red carpet treatment and a promise of more money. But how do they treat their people at Tiananmen Square and currently throughout their whole country? They abuse civil liberties there.

But are we going to do the same thing? Do Members think we can do that? We pick and choose and pretend that we are going to perform this great system of justice on the world. Indonesia today, they are getting bailed out by the American taxpayer to the tune of tens of billions of dollars. They mistreat in a serious manner the people in East Timor. But here we decide all of a sudden that we are going to, through the United Nations, expose the American taxpayer, expose young American soldiers, because how are we going to enforce these things? Where do we get this authority to be the policeman of the world?

I do not believe we have this authority. I believe it is detrimental overall to our national security. I believe it is a threat to the American people and indirectly, in many ways, to the taxpayer. I object. I object generally to so many of these amendments, so well-intended. I do not disagree with the challenges, the charges made against Iraq and the leadership. I strongly criticize the approach to trying to solve this very serious problem.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First, would the gentleman suggest that there is not a relationship between freedom and peace?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the gentleman is getting at. I know the most important thing for freedom and peace is for me to obey the Constitution. Where is it the authority of the Constitution for us to police the world?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman is suggesting, then, that this body

should not have condemned Adolf Hitler until he actually attacked the United States, is that what he would suggest? Is that his foreign policy?

Mr. PAUL. I think that is not the debate on the floor right now. I think when our national security is threatened, the American people have a right to vote through their Congressmen for a declaration of war.

This is the kind of thing that leads to Vietnam War-type wars and U.N. sanctions. This is the kind of thing that leads to Koreas, Vietnams and useless wars. This is why we did not win the war in the Persian Gulf and why we are still faced with this problem.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Short of a declaration of war, the gentleman does not think the United States Government should do anything about tyranny?

Mr. PAUL. I believe in the responsibility of this U.S. Congress to assume that they are the ones that declare war in a proper manner.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have no criticism about those who are challenging the leadership in Iraq. I condemn them. I challenge, though, the technique that we are using, the process that we are using. I do not believe we have the authority. Long-term, it is not effective.

It is totally inconsistent when we are dealing with China. These token resolutions that we dealt with on China will have nothing to do with solving the problem. At the same time, we give them more money, we give the Turks more money, we give China more money, we give Indonesia more money, and they are all in the process of abusing civil liberties. I just think that we have conveniently picked a whipping horse and we are pretending that we are doing some good.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say to the gentleman who just finished speaking that I certainly respect the consistency of his ideas, but I disagree. If he had expressed those ideas as a member of the parliament in Turkey or if he expressed them in Iraq or in Indonesia, he might well find himself in the same situation as Leyla Zana and the Kurdish parliamentarians found themselves and, that is, behind bars. It seems to me that if we do not recognize that we are our brothers' and sisters' keeper, that our freedoms and theirs are in some way connected, we will invite the kind of terrorism that Saddam Hussein practices on his people and others practice on their people throughout this world.

□ 1430

Let me agree with him, however, in part. Let us stop giving money to the Turks as long as they repress their people. Let us stop giving money to the Indonesian Government that takes away the religious freedoms of the people of East Timor. Let us stop supporting dic-

tators that deny the basic human rights of their people.

I believe that we attempt very strongly to be consistent. We passed nine bills dealing with China. Those bills do have a potential, particularly the one on Radio Free Asia that will broadcast to China and Tibet and North Korea and Burma. I think we have a potential for positively impacting their society.

Let us never give up our ideals and our beliefs in human freedom, the very foundation of this society, because we might see a little inconsistency or cannot find the exact words we want to give us authority. The authority is moral authority, and it has a great power in this world if only we will exercise it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 137.

The question was taken.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question de novo on the motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

ESTABLISHMENT OF 2,500 BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS BEFORE 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1753, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1753, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 476) to provide for the establishment of not less than 2,500 Boys and Girls Clubs of America facilities by the year 2000, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.